Claims 2-8, 10-17, 35-41 and 43-50 have been rejected by the Examiner. Claims 3, 6, 7, 11, 13, 36, 39, 40, 44 and 46 have been amended. Claims 2-8, 10-17, 35- 41 and 43-50 are now pending. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

In "Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103" on page 3 of the above-identified Final Office Action, claims 2-8, 10-17, 35-41 and 43-50 have been rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0093694 (hereinafter Medvinsky) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,809,144 (hereinafter Sirbu) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6, 286, 104 (hereinafter Buhle) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

Amended independent claim 7 recites an apparatus comprising

> receiving by a granting service of a computing device, the computing device being different and distinct from a client, a request for a Service Ticket from the client
> the granting service determining if the requested service is provided by a plurality of servers:
> if not, the granting service generating the Service Ticket utilizing a single server mode; and
> if so, the granting service:
> > generating a session key;
> > for each providing server, encrypting the session key with a secret key associated with each respective server;
> > creating a Service Ticket that includes the encrypted session keys for the pluralilty of providing servers; and
> > transmitting the Service Ticket to the client."

In the above-identified Final Office Action, besides other readings, the Examiner cited figure 3 and column 8, lines 14-19 of Buhle to read on the features "encrypting the session key with a secret key …" and "creating a Service Ticket…" recited in the previously presented claim 7. Applicants submit that Buhle fails to teach or suggest "… encrypting the session key with a secret key associated with each respective server" and "creating a Service Ticket that includes the encrypted session keys for the pluralilty of providing servers" in currently amended claim 7.

- 12 -

Buhle describes a database system that seeks to remedy perceived deficiencies of "middle-tier" servers acting as an interface between clients and database servers. As described in Buhle, a middle-tier server authenticates to the database server using the middle-tier server's own username and password and then, receives a credential from the data server which is used by the middle-tier server to establish a new session between the client and the data server under the client's username and using the received credential.

The cited column 8, lines 14-19 and Figure 3 of Buhle disclose that the middle-tier server recieves credentials from multiple data servers that may be used by the middle-tier server to establish client sessions with the data servers. Even if assumed arguendo, the data servers in Buhle may read on the "providing servers" of claim 7, Applicants submit that the credentials from multiple data servers in Buhle cannot be used to read on the "Service Ticket" in amended claim 7.

It is true that in the cited portion of Buhle, it is described that "a credential may be a Kerberos ticket, a token or another suitable mechansim." However, merely a sentence like that, does not provide any basis that the credentials in Buhle could be used to read on the "Service Ticket" that is specifically defined in claim 7. As recited in amended claim 7, the Service Ticket includes session keys for the plurality of servers providing the desired service. However, Buhle fails to disclose what is included in the credentials or what is the structure of the credentials. So, the credentials in Buhle fail to read on the "Service Ticket" in amended claim 7.

Also, Applicants submit that nothing in Buhle, including the credentials, can read on the "encrypted session keys" in amended claim 7. According to claim 7, the session keys are encrypted "with a secret key associated with each respective server," whereas Buhle discloses no operations executed towards the credentials. Actually, according to the cited portion of Buhle, those credentials are used directly for establishing client sessions, which further proves that the credentials are not encrypted or included together in a service ticket for further usage.

In "Response to Arguments" on page 2 of the above-identified Final Office Action, the Examiner stated that Bulhe discloses establishing a session that is authenticated with cryptographic means; after the session is established the server grants a set of "roles or

- 13 -

privileges" that may be accessed. And these "roles or privileges" are analogous to the claimed feature of "a Service Ticket" in claim 7. Applicants respectfully disagree. According to col. 4, lines 24-28, it is recited that the privileges/roles are the ability to perform various operations and access data that a client or application server may require. These privileges/roles are abstract concepts describing the degree of authentication that a client device/server may get, rather than a specific "Service Ticket" in claim 7 that can be transmitted from a granting service to a client device and including encrypted session keys for the plurality of service providing servers.

Medvinsky and Sirbu fail to cure the above deficiency of Buhle. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the combination of Medvinsky, Sirbu, and Buhle fails to teach or suggest each and every element of amended claim 7.

Furthermore, Applicants submit that there would have been no motivation to modify Buhle to achieve the undisclosed features in amended claim 7. According to col. 1, line 66 – col. 2, line 5, the purpose of Buhle is to provide a rlational database system that allows a database administrator to limit or restrict authority and ability of middle-tier servers. Incorporating the undisclosed features of amended claim 7 directed to make use of server pools under Kerberos protocol, would have no contribution to, or even increase the complexity in achieving the purpose of Buhle. Thus, for at least these reasons, one of ordinary skill would have found no suggestion to modify Buhle to achieve the recitation of amended claim 7.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 is patentable over the combination of Medvinsky, Sirbu, and Buhle under 35 USC §103(a). Claims 2-6 and 8 depend from claim 7. Thus, for at least the same reasons, Applicants submit that these claims are also patentable over the combination of Medvinsky, Sirbu, and Buhle under 35 USC §103(a).

Amended independent claims 13, 40, and 46 contain subject matter generally similar to claim 7. Also, claims 11-12 and 14-17 depend from claim 13, claims 35-39 and 41 depend from claim 40, and claims 43-45 and 47-50 depend from claim 46. Thus, for at least the same reasons as with claim 7 above, Applicants submit that claims 10-17, 35-41, and 43-50 are also patentable over the combination of Medvinsky, Sirbu, and Buhle under 35 USC §103(a).

- 14 -

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the remain pending claims 2-8, 10-17, 35-41 and 43-50 are solicited. As a result of the amendments made herein, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present paper, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at 206-381-8819. If any fees are due in connection with filing this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the Deposit Account of Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C., No. 50-0393.

Respectfully submitted,
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.

Dated: 01/12/2009   /Al AuYeung/
                                           Al AuYeung
                                           Reg. No. 35,432

Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.
Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: 503-222-9981